

Message

From: Senn, John [Senn.John@epa.gov]
Sent: 6/13/2017 1:53:12 PM
To: Grantham, Nancy [Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: NANCY: StarNews follow-up RE: GenX, PFASs in the Cape Fear River watershed

Can we chat about this when you have a minute? I'm in all day.

From: Grantham, Nancy
Sent: Tuesday, June 13, 2017 7:24 AM
To: Dunton, Cheryl <Dunton.Cheryl@epa.gov>; Jones, Enesta <Jones.Enesta@epa.gov>; Senn, John <Senn.John@epa.gov>
Cc: Lynn, Tricia <lynn.tricia@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: NANCY: StarNews follow-up RE: GenX, PFASs in the Cape Fear River watershed

Thanks

Nancy Grantham
Office of Public Affairs
US Environmental Protection Agency
202-564-6879 (desk)
202-253-7056 (mobile)

From: Dunton, Cheryl
Sent: Tuesday, June 13, 2017 7:23 AM
To: Grantham, Nancy <Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov>; Jones, Enesta <Jones.Enesta@epa.gov>; Senn, John <Senn.John@epa.gov>
Cc: Lynn, Tricia <lynn.tricia@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: NANCY: StarNews follow-up RE: GenX, PFASs in the Cape Fear River watershed

Adding John in OECA since he was working on the enforcement related ones with his folks.

From: Grantham, Nancy
Sent: Tuesday, June 13, 2017 7:21 AM
To: Jones, Enesta <Jones.Enesta@epa.gov>
Cc: Dunton, Cheryl <Dunton.Cheryl@epa.gov>; Lynn, Tricia <lynn.tricia@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: NANCY: StarNews follow-up RE: GenX, PFASs in the Cape Fear River watershed

Just talked with Cheryl – let's use the statement from yesterday – and Cheryl has her folks working on some other answers so we have a plan b .. thanks ng

Nancy Grantham
Office of Public Affairs
US Environmental Protection Agency
202-564-6879 (desk)
202-253-7056 (mobile)

From: Jones, Enesta
Sent: Tuesday, June 13, 2017 7:19 AM
To: Grantham, Nancy <Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov>

Cc: Dunton, Cheryl <Dunton.Cheryl@epa.gov>; Lynn, Tricia <lynn.tricia@epa.gov>; Jones, Enesta <Jones.Enesta@epa.gov>

Subject: NANCY: StarNews follow-up RE: GenX, PFASs in the Cape Fear River watershedt

Hi Nancy,

Are we only providing a desk statement to respond to inquiries -- and not answering question by question?

Enesta Jones
U.S. EPA
Office of Media Relations
Office: 202.564.7873
Cell: 202.236.2426

"The root of all joy is gratefulness."

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Strauss, Linda" <Strauss.Linda@epa.gov>
Date: June 13, 2017 at 7:16:44 AM EDT
To: "Jones, Enesta" <Jones.Enesta@epa.gov>
Cc: "Jakob, Avivah" <Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov>, "Schmit, Ryan" <schmit.ryan@epa.gov>, "Dunton, Cheryl" <Dunton.Cheryl@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: OCSPP: StarNews follow-up RE: GenX, PFASs in the Cape Fear River watershedt

On vacation. Can you touch base with Nancy Grantham and Cheryl Dunton on the desk statement on this.

Sent from my iPhone

On Jun 13, 2017, at 6:29 AM, Jones, Enesta <Jones.Enesta@epa.gov> wrote:

Hi all, the reporter is back with follow-up that he would like us to address by NLT today.

First, I'm curious if EPA has taken or is contemplating any action as a result of these discoveries. The response cited the fact that these are emerging substances that aren't regulated and seemed to indicate no action would result. Is that still the case?

Second, I have a number of questions regarding the consent order issued by EPA to DuPont (now Chemours) for the manufacture of GenX:

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

3) How are the overall terms of such a consent order enforced? Who is responsible? What is the process?

4) Has DuPont and/or Chemours satisfied all the requirements for submitting toxicological/environmental studies? Where can I obtain those? Have any changes been made to the consent order since it was issued, including changes in amounts allowed to be manufactured and monitoring? If so, who sought the changes and what are they?

5) The consent order includes this exception: (3) Byproducts. The requirements of this Order do not apply to the PMN substances when they are produced, without separate commercial intent, only as a "byproduct" as defined at 40 CFR 720.3(d) and in compliance with 40 CFR 720.30(g).

Here are those federal register entries:

40 CFR 720.3(d) Byproduct means a chemical substance produced without a separate commercial intent during the manufacture, processing, use, or disposal of another chemical substance or mixture.

40 CFR 720.30(g) Any byproduct if its only commercial purpose is for use by public or private organizations that (1) burn it as a fuel, (2) dispose of it as a waste, including in a landfill or for enriching soil, or (3) extract component chemical substances from it for commercial purposes. (This exclusion only applies to the byproduct; it does not apply to the component substances extracted from the byproduct.)

If GenX were generated as a byproduct in a process not meant to produce it and in which it was not extracted for commercial use, would this exception apply?

Enesta Jones
U.S. EPA
Office of Media Relations
Office: 202.564.7873
Cell: 202.236.2426

"The root of all joy is gratefulness."

On Jun 2, 2017, at 4:00 PM, Strauss, Linda <Strauss.Linda@epa.gov> wrote:

Enesta, hold for now.

We're waiting to see if OECA or OGC or others in OPPT can add to this Monday AM.

Linda

From: Strauss, Linda
Sent: Friday, June 02, 2017 2:49 PM
To: Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>; Blair, Susanna <Blair.Susanna@epa.gov>; Grant, Brian <Grant.Brian@epa.gov>; Senn, John <Senn.John@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: ORD + OCSPP: StarNews RE: GenX, PFASs in the Cape Fear River watershed

Brian and John,

Reporter's Question: In its review of the GenX premanufacture submission, EPA determined that the chemical could be commercialized if there were no releases to water.

Obviously, it **is in the water. So, what happens now?**

OPPT's suggested response to this Q is this:

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

Is there anything else that can be added to this so that we are being a little more responsive to the people of N.C.? Thanks!

Linda

From: Strauss, Linda
Sent: Friday, June 02, 2017 2:38 PM
To: Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>; Blair, Susanna <Blair.Susanna@epa.gov>
Cc: Senn, John <Senn.John@epa.gov>; Perlis, Robert <Perlis.Robert@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: ORD + OCSPP: StarNews RE: GenX, PFASs in the Cape Fear River watershed

Alison and Susanna, when you get the response can you get it OKed by OPPT management since this is such a sensitive one. Adding John Senn, OECA and Bob P, OGC.

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

Thanks!

Linda

From: Jones, Enesta
Sent: Friday, June 02, 2017 12:59 PM
To: Maguire, Megan <Maguire.Megan@epa.gov>; Strauss, Linda <Strauss.Linda@epa.gov>; Sauerhage, Maggie <Sauerhage.Maggie@epa.gov>; Hubbard, Carolyn <Hubbard.Carolyn@epa.gov>
Cc: Jones, Enesta <Jones.Enesta@epa.gov>
Subject: ORD + OCSPP: StarNews RE: GenX, PFASs in the Cape Fear River watershed

Any input?

Hi All,

The reporter returned with the follow-up below. Can you help address beyond what we already provided? He also asked for an interview with the scientists, which we will decline.

Here was the first question:

The lead author (Mei Sun) has confirmed that the treatment plant at Community C in the paper is the Cape Fear Public Utility Authority in Wilmington, N.C. I'd like to know how someone in the community served by CFPUA should interpret these results, specifically in terms of the concentrations of GenX. According to the paper, median concentrations were 671 ppb. I'm asking this in the context of EPA's latest advisory level for PFOA/PFOS, which GenX is meant to replace. As I understand it, the advisory level for

PFOA/PFOS is 70 ppt. GenX was present at several times that concentration. Does this raise any health concerns at all? Is this nothing to be concerned about?

While I realize there were other PFASs found at higher concentrations, I'd like to focus, specifically, on GenX for now. I didn't ask about the other substances.

2) You write:

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

**Enesta Jones
U.S. EPA
Office of Media Relations
Office: 202.564.7873
Cell: 202.236.2426**

"The root of all joy is gratefulness."

On May 30, 2017, at 5:10 PM, Maguire, Megan
<Maguire.Megan@epa.gov> wrote:

Hi Enesta- These seem to be using old ORD responses.
Please use the ORD response that we sent on Thursday.

Our only input is these two sentences for # 1: Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

Also, can you make sure these responses are NOT attributed to ORD's Andy Lindstrom and Mark Strynar? Although the inquiry came into them these responses

are Agency-wide and far outside of what they would respond to.

Please use the below to respond to questions 1 & 2:

I'd like to know how someone in the community served by CFPUA should interpret these results, specifically in terms of the concentrations of GenX. According to the paper, median concentrations were 671 ppb. I'm asking this in the context of EPA's latest advisory level for PFOA/PFOS, which GenX is meant to replace. As I understand it, the advisory level for PFOA/PFOS is 70 ppt. GenX was present at several times that concentration. Does this raise any health concerns at all? Is this nothing to be concerned about?

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

2. What is the status of EPA's review of the environmental and human safety of GenX? What is the EPA's current position regarding the safety of GenX?

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

Thanks,
Megan

Megan Maguire
US EPA, Office of Research and Development
RRB 41261
O: (202)564-6636
C: (202)731-9378

From: Jones, Enesta
Sent: Tuesday, May 30, 2017 11:36 AM
To: Strauss, Linda <Strauss.Linda@epa.gov>; Maguire, Megan <Maguire.Megan@epa.gov>; Jakob, Avivah <Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov>; Sauerhage, Maggie <Sauerhage.Maggie@epa.gov>; Hubbard, Carolyn <Hubbard.Carolyn@epa.gov>
Cc: Jones, Enesta <Jones.Enesta@epa.gov>; Daguiard, Robert <Daguiard.Robert@epa.gov>
Subject: ORD + OCSPP: StarNews RE: GenX, PFASs in the Cape Fear River watershed

Good day, all.

Hope everyone had a nice holiday. I enjoyed my time at the beach.

We're getting closer to closing this one. Please see below and let me know if you have any additional edits -- and if you are ok with OW's edits before COB today.

1. I'd like to know how someone in the community served by CFPUA should interpret these results, specifically in terms of the concentrations of GenX. According to the paper, median concentrations were 671 ppb. I'm asking this in the context of EPA's latest advisory level for PFOA/PFOS, which GenX is meant to replace. As I understand it, the advisory level for PFOA/PFOS is 70 ppt. GenX was present at several times that concentration. Does this raise any health concerns at all? Is this nothing to be concerned about?

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

*2. What is the status of EPA's review of the environmental and human safety of GenX?
What is the EPA's current position regarding the safety of GenX?*

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

3. Has or will the EPA take any actions regarding the results from this paper?

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

4. Is the EPA monitoring the situation and/or conducting its own tests regarding GenX in the Cape Fear River watershed? If so, what, specifically is or will it do and when? If nothing is has been done or is planned, why not? What would it take for the EPA to get involved regarding this situation?

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

5. The lead author has confirmed that the fluorochemical manufacturer located upstream of the CFPUA is a plant in Fayetteville, N.C., formerly owned by DuPont and now by Chemours. Has the EPA contacted the plant operator regarding these findings? If so, what was the nature of that communication? If not, why not?

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process